DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 474 FL 003 530

AUTHOR	Ahmann, J. Stanley; Lambert, B. Geraldine
TITLE	An Evaluation of a Bilingual Education Program: Annual Report 1970-71.
INSTITUTION	Saint Martin Parish School Board, St. Martinville, La.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Bilingual Education.
REPORT NO	P-OE-7-321
PUB DATE	15 Jun 71
NOTE	36p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; *Elementary Schools; English; Evaluation Methods; Fles; *French; Negro Youth; *Performance Criteria; *Program Evaluation; Standardized Tests

ABSTRACT

This annual report of an ongoing bilingual education program being conducted at St. Martin Parish evaluates data gathered between February and May 1971. A large segment of both the control and experimental groups is French dominant or black. Achievement of performance objectives by kindergarten and first grade students was evaluated by both teachers and monitors. A series of standardized tests, including the Stanford Achievement Test, was administered and results of the tests are discussed. Twenty-two tables of data are included. (RL)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROJECT NO OE 7-321
321
TITLE VII.
BESE

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: RC FL
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED 071474

An Evaluation of A Bilingual Education Program

RECEIVED
AUG 2 1972
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

ANNUAL REPORT

1970-71

St. Martin Parish
Breaux Bridge, Louisiana
Hazel Delahoussaye, Director

Project # OE 7-321

Prepared by:

Dr. J. Stanley Ahmann
National Assessment of Educational Progress
Denver, Colorado

Dr. B. Geraldine Lambert
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Lafayette, Louisiana

FL003 530

According to the plan for evaluating the bilingual education program during the 1970-71 academic year, a portion of the evaluative data was gathered in February and the remainder in May, 1971. On the basis of the analysis of these results, it was planned that the staff of the project could, as needed, make adjustments in the program. The following are the highlights of the information gathered.

In Table 1 (see appendix) are shown the various classifications of the students participating in the program. Approximately 40% of the students in the experimental and control group are black. In the case of the experimental, approximately 55% of the group is French dominant, whereas in the case of the control groups approximately 60% falls in this classification. The first grade experimental and control groups had somewhat more French dominant students than English dominant, whereas in the case of kindergarten groups, the number of French and English dominant students was about the same.

Mastery of Performance Objectives

The mastery of performance objectives for each pupil in both experimental and control groups was determined for kindergarten and first grade students by both teachers and monitors. This data gathering effort was partially incomplete since, on

occasion, teacher cooperation was absent or monitors were unable to observe certain types of student behavior. The data that were available are summarized in Tables 2 through 5.

The mastery of performance objectives for the instruction component (product) was reported for kindergarten in Tables 2 and 4, and for first grade in Tables 3 and 5. Data for both experimental and control groups, including both English dominant and French dominant students, are included.

In the case of the kindergarten group, greater achievement was displayed in May than in January. Furthermore, French dominant students tended to surpass in achievement that of the English dominant students. Sometimes the difference was pronounced. Conceivably, these differences were caused by the nature of the performance objectives since they often emphasized French language items.

The differences between the students in the control group and the students in the experimental group in terms of achievement are difficult to analyze since the data for the control group is incomplete. Those data which are present suggest that the two groups performed in somewhat the same manner in terms of a number of the performance objectives.

In the case of the first grade groups, again certain data were missing, particularly with regard to the control

groups as reported by teachers. To be sure, the performance of the first grade students typically surpassed that of the kindergarten students. On the other hand, since 100% achievement occurred periodically in May, the differential achievement between kindergarten and first grade is difficult to analyze.

As in the case of the kindergarten groups, it is apparent that the performance of the first grade students in May surpassed the performance of those groups in January. Furthermore, there is a tendency for the French dominant students to surpass the English dominant students in the degree of achievement with respect to various performance objectives.

Observations of Student Behavior in the Affective Domain

Whenever possible, the monitors observed the behavior of students which could be classified in the affective domain. These observations were made for both experimental and control groups in both first grade classes and kindergarten classes. The results of observations are summarized in Tables 19 through 22.

When interpreting the data in these tables, it must be recognized that the monitors did not have the opportunity to observe all students for a prolonged period of time. Since the sampling of behavior may not necessarily be representative, it is important that the data in Tables 19 through 22 be studied

only in terms of major changes or shifts rather than in terms of small differences.

Keeping in mind the limitations mentioned in the foregoing paragraph, one finds it difficult to identify any pronounced trend in the data included in the tables in question. There are instances when the experimental group at both grade levels surpasses the control group in terms of the short descriptions listed in Tables 19 and 20. The reverse is also true. In short, the findings are mixed.

Largely the same reaction is gained from study of Tables 21 and 22. In these two tables, short descriptions of behavior are listed and the frequency of occurrence is identified as accurately as possible. Perhaps these data, like those in Tables 19 and 20, will serve as reference points for the interpretation of the evaluation data yielded in the 1971-72 effort.

Analysis of Scores from Standardized Tests

Early in 1971, the Metropolitan Readiness Test was administered to all kindergarten students, and the Stanford Achievement Test was administered to all first grade students. The results of these test administrations are shown in Tables 6 and 7.

In the case of French dominant children, the control group surpassed the experimental group slightly. This difference was noticed in the third and first quartile. In the case of the English dominant kindergarten children, a slight advantage existed for the experimental group. This was most noticeable in the third quartile.

The data from the Stanford Achievement Test was analyzed in terms of the six subtest scores for that test. In the case of the French dominant first grade students, there was an uneven picture existing between the experimental group and the control group in terms of the five subtest scores dealing with language arts. In three instances there is at least a slight advantage for the control group and in two instances the same was true for the experimental group. The control group surpassed somewhat the performance of the experimental group in terms of the arithmetic test when administered to French dominant students. In a roughly similar manner, a mixed picture existed when one compares the English dominant students in the experimental group with those of the control group.

French Achievement Test Results

Only the experimental group was administered the test at each grade level. The results are shown in Tables 8 and 9.

The test results are difficult to interpret because the test had never been used before and no norms are available.

Seemingly, the performance was low but this conclusion should not be drawn until further use of the test demonstrates its level of difficulty. Hence, the data in Tables 8 and 9 may well be useful as a reference point for interpreting test results yielded by the 1971-72 evaluation.

Achievement of Performance Objectives for Instructional Component (Process)

All members of the teaching teams responded to a questionnaire in which they indicated the frequency with which certain instructional activities took place. The specific details of this questionnaire are found in form 6 of the "Evaluator's Record".

The questionnaire was administered in February and May. The results of this administration are shown in Table 10. It is clear from this table that the frequency with which many activities took place was great. In some, but not all, cases the frequency increased from February to May. In addition, it is significant that teachers feel that they as individuals had a greater appreciation for the cultural heritage of the community and its environment, and that the French dominant students are actively engaged in the instructional process.

Staff Development

The Director of the project interviewed the master teachers, specialist teachers and other school personnel.

The degree to which master teachers and specialist teachers are achieving the various objectives is shown in Tables 11 and 12. Interviews took place both in February and May.

Inspection of Tables 11 and 12 reveals that a high percentage of teachers achieved many of the objectives in question and that this comparatively high level occurred as early as February. Typically, it was maintained, if not increased, in May.

The Director rating of school personnel and the sub-rating by those personnel with regard to 14 objectives shown in form 9 of the "Evaluator's Record" are shown in Tables 13 and 14. The data from these tables showed that both the Director and the school personnel themselves are convinced that a high degree of achievement of the objectives in question is occurring. In other words, improvement in the quality of instruction and in the teaching skills of the teachers was noticeable to a pronounced degree in February and continued at a high level in May.

Community Involvement

Throughout the 1970-71 academic year the teachers tabulated the number of contacts and communications from parents, and the Director interviewed the members of the Advisory Committee. The results are shown in Tables 15 and 16. Inspection of these tables shows that the parents of the

students participating in the experimental program have been in frequent touch with the teachers of the program. This is viewed as a highly favorable indicator of parental involvement, particularly when one notes that the number of contacts increased to a pronounced degree from February to May.

Based on the data in Table 16, the members of the Advisory Committee who were interviewed had a most favorable attitude towards the program in February, and this attitude remained unchanged through May. The specific questions asked the members of the Advisory Committee are shown in Form 12 of the "Evaluator's Record". With unusual consistency, the parents responded in a favorable manner with respect to the importance of their involvement as a member of the Advisory Committee.

The Director also interviewed the parents of a sample of students and school personnel. The data are shown in Tables 17 and 18. Once again, these interviews revealed a highly positive reaction to the bilingual education program.

Publicity concerning the bilingual education program was extensive and well received. The files in the office of the Director contain copies of innumerable press releases in newspapers in the region. Often attractive and pertinent pictures were included in these press releases. Complete details can be obtained by inspecting the files of the Director.

Participation by parents in school meetings was unusually high. When parent night was held at the experimental schools in February and in May, the percent of parents attending ranged as high as 100%. Often the percentage fell between 60 and 90%.

Associated with these visits were frequent inquiries regarding the scope and intent of the bilingual education program. Parents regularly expressed the hope that the program would be expanded to more schools and would be continued in the future. In the files in the office of the Director are innumerable communications illustrating a very strong parental backing of this innovative program.

TABLE 1

CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE DOMINANCE		
	ENGLISH	FRENCH	TOTAL
B L A C K	28	81	109
N O T B L A C K	89	74	163
T O T A L	117	155	272
M A L E	64	77	141
F E M A L E	53	78	131
T O T A L	117	155	272
EXPERIMENTAL			
K I N D E R G A R T E N	43	36	79
F I R S T G R A D E	29	51	80
T O T A L	72	87	159
CONTROL			
K I N D E R G A R T E N	28	31	59
F I R S T G R A D E	17	37	54
T O T A L	45	68	113

June 15, 1971

TABLE 2

MASTERY OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE

(INSTRUCTION: PRODUCT)

TEACHER RECORD

KINDERGARTEN

OBJECTIVE NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING OBJECTIVE							
	EXPERIMENTAL				CONTROL			
	ENGLISH DOMINANT		FRENCH DOMINANT		ENGLISH DOMINANT		FRENCH DOMINANT	
	JANUARY	MAY	JANUARY	MAY	JANUARY	MAY	JANUARY	MAY
1	94%	96%	100%	100%		100%		93%
2	79%	81%	100%	100%		100%		93%
3	35%	86%	100%	100%		100%		87%
4		37%	83%	100%		97%		
5		5%	55%	92%		97%		
6	26%	26%	100%	100%		100%		
7		74%	38%	58%		90%		
8		58%	40%	52%		90%		
9		35%	60%	100%		93%		
10			28%	78%		81%		
11						84%		80%
12		9%		33%		97%		
13		9%				81%		
14	26%	26%				77%		
15		21%				48%		73%
16	21%	40%	86%	100%		87%		80%
17		26%	30%	61%		100%		
18		46%	40%	72%		74%		
19		16%	57%	100%		97%		
20			60%	100%		97%		
21	33%	72%	100%	100%		100%		80%
22		44%	77%	100%		97%		
23	26%	67%	56%	100%		81%		
24	21%	70%	50%	100%		81%		
25	28%	70%	78%	100%		90%		
26			14%	72%		68%		33%
27	49%	63%	69%	83%		100%		
28	21%	33%	22%	50%		100%		
29	70%	60%	100%	100%		100%		100%
30	44%	81%	58%	86%		97%		
31	33%	51%	64%	81%		100%		
32	58%	81%	100%	100%		93%		

June 15, 1971

TABLE 3

MASTERY OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

(INSTRUCTION: PRODUCT)

TEACHER RECORD

FIRST GRADE

OBJECTIVE NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING OBJECTIVE							
	EXPERIMENTAL				CONTROL			
	ENGLISH DOMINANT		FRENCH DOMINANT		ENGLISH DOMINANT		FRENCH DOMINANT	
	JANUARY	MAY	JANUARY	MAY	JANUARY	MAY	JANUARY	MAY
1	90%	90%	94%	100%		100%		
2	90%	90%	100%	100%		100%		
3	72%	75%	88%	100%		100%		
4		14%	90%	100%		100%		
5			53%	98%		100%		
6	14%	14%	80%	100%		100%		
7		86%	45%	92%		88%		
8		86%	41%	94%		92%		
9		14%	69%	100%		96%		
10			18%	63%		76%		
11			69%	98%		100%		
12		62%	94%	100%		100%		
13		14%	33%	96%		96%		
14	10%	14%	76%	98%		96%		
15		10%	20%	65%		96%		
16	45%	69%	86%	100%		92%		
17		14%	73%	98%		100%		
18		7%	29%	69%		96%		
19		69%	86%	100%		88%		
20			78%	100%		100%		
21	66%	79%	94%	100%		100%		
22		34%	90%	100%		92%		
23	55%	76%	92%	100%		100%		
24	76%	90%	92%	100%		100%		
25	62%	86%	98%	100%		100%		
26			100%	100%		100%		
27	28%	66%	100%	100%		88%		
28	24%	52%	82%	96%		68%		
29	86%	90%	96%	100%		100%		
30	66%	90%	100%	100%		88%		
31	14%	76%	100%	100%		96%		
32	83%	90%	100%	100%		100%		

June 15, 1971

TABLE 4

MASTERY OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

(INSTRUCTION: PRODUCT)

MONITOR RECORD

KINDERGARTEN

OBJECTIVE NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING OBJECTIVE					
	EXPERIMENTAL			CONTROL		
	ENGLISH DOMINANT	FRENCH DOMINANT	TOTAL	ENGLISH DOMINANT	FRENCH DOMINANT	TOTAL
1	88%	83%	85%	93%	97%	95%
2	12%	61%	37%	43%	52%	47%
3	98%	83%	91%	93%	89%	91%
4		67%	33%		47%	23%
5	74%	86%	80%	79%	64%	92%
6	67%	14%	35%	32%	89%	61%
7	88%	97%	94%	54%	61%	57%
8	9%	72%	40%	54%	67%	60%
9	16%	100%	58%	25%		12%
10		100%	50%		58%	29%
11	16%	58%	37%			
12		67%	33%			
13						
14						
15						
16	16%		8%	25%	50%	37%
17				25%	33%	29%
18				28%	36%	32%
19				21%	16%	18%
20	7%	50%	28%	19%	28%	23%
21	7%	11%	9%	71%	72%	71%
22	2%		1%	11%	3%	7%
23	12%	3%	7%	93%	72%	82%
24	39%	8%	24%	43%	47%	45%
25		14%	7%	19%	28%	23%
26	53%	28%	36%	19%	42%	30%
27	49%	78%	64%	50%		25%
28	30%		15%	7%		3%
29		36%	18%	50%	33%	41%
30		72%	36%	19%	14%	16%
31		67%	33%		11%	5%
32						

June 15, 1971

TABLE 5

MASTERY OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

(INSTRUCTION: PRODUCT)

MONITOR RECORD

FIRST GRADE

OBJECTIVE NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING OBJECTIVE					
	EXPERIMENTAL			CONTROL		
	ENGLISH DOMINANT	FRENCH DOMINANT	TOTAL	ENGLISH DOMINANT	FRENCH DOMINANT	TOTAL
1	72%	75%	73%	24%	61%	43%
2	72%	53%	64%	100%	72%	86%
3	72%	71%	71%	12%	83%	47%
4	72%	80%	76%		52%	26%
5	72%	63%	67%	41%	47%	44%
6	69%	53%	61%	18%	33%	25%
7	72%	37%	54%	24%	36%	30%
8	24%	51%	37%	24%	42%	33%
9	69%	86%	78%	24%	8%	16%
10	68%	75%	71%	24%	31%	27%
11	90%	96%	93%	12%	72%	42%
12	95%	100%	97%	41%	56%	48%
13	84%	86%	85%	35%	16%	25%
14	88%	86%	87%	35%	19%	27%
15	60%	59%	59%	41%	19%	30%
16	20%		10%	18%	52%	35%
17	20%	10%	15%			
18	24%	65%	43%	6%		3%
19	20%	2%	11%	18%	42%	30%
20	20%	31%	25%			
21		45%	22%	24%	39%	31%
22		6%	3%			
23				41%	22%	31%
24		33%	15%	24%	47%	45%
25	41%	6%	23%	24%	52%	52%
26		17%	9%	6%	16%	11%
27	34%	45%	40%			
28		6%	3%			
29		33%	17%	18%	50%	34%
30					44%	22%
31	3%		1%		11%	5%
32						

June 15, 1971

TABLE 6

1971 METROPOLITAN READINESS TEST RESULTS

(KINDERGARTEN)

(FEBRUARY SCORES)

GROUPS	QUARTILE PERCENTAGES							
	FRENCH DOMINANT				ENGLISH DOMINANT			
	First Quartile	Second Quartile	Third Quartile	Fourth Quartile	First Quartile	Second Quartile	Third Quartile	Fourth Quartile
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP	80%	15%	3%	2%	51%	23%	25%	4%
CONTROL GROUP	70%	15%	15%	0%	50%	25%	16%	9%
TOTAL	75%	15%	8%	2%	51%	24%	20%	5%

June 15, 1971

NOTE: A. Experimental group includes Parks and Breaux Bridge

B. Control group is Cecilia

TABLE 7

1971 STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

(FIRST GRADE)
(FEBRUARY SCORES)

SUBTEST AREAS	STANINES	STANINE SCORE - PERCENTAGES			
		EXPERIMENTAL GROUP		CONTROL GROUP	
		FR. DOM.	ENG. DOM.	FR. DOM.	ENG. DOM.
WORD READING	7-9	0%	0%	0%	6%
	4-6	18%	28%	51%	52%
	1-3	82%	72%	49%	42%
PARAGRAPH MEANING	7-9	0%	0%	0%	20%
	4-6	50%	46%	60%	54%
	1-3	50%	54%	40%	26%
VOCABULARY	7-9	0%	8%	3%	13%
	4-6	54%	64%	34%	50%
	1-3	46%	28%	63%	37%
SPELLING	7-9	0%	0%	14%	24%
	4-6	42%	46%	26%	44%
	1-3	58%	54%	60%	32%
WORD STUDY SKILLS	7-9	2%	3%	4%	0%
	4-6	62%	72%	41%	55%
	1-3	36%	25%	55%	45%
ARITHMETIC SKILLS	7-9	0%	14%	8%	0%
	4-6	60%	70%	33%	62%
	1-3	40%	16%	59%	38%

June 15, 1971

NOTE: A. Experimental group includes Parks and Breaux Bridge

B. Control group is Cecilia

TABLE 8

FRENCH ACHIEVEMENT TEST

(KINDERGARTEN)

GROUPS	QUARTILE PERCENTAGES							
	FRENCH DOMINANT				ENGLISH DOMINANT			
	First Quartile	Second Quartile	Third Quartile	Fourth Quartile	First Quartile	Second Quartile	Third Quartile	Fourth Quartile
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP		5%	9%	86%		10%	23%	67%
CONTROL GROUP								
TOTAL								

June 15, 1971

NOTE: A. Experimental group includes Parks and Breaux Bridge

B. Control group is Cecilia

TABLE 9

FRENCH ACHIEVEMENT TEST

(FIRST GRADE)

GROUPS	QUARTILE PERCENTAGES							
	FRENCH DOMINANT				ENGLISH DOMINANT			
	First Quartile	Second Quartile	Third Quartile	Fourth Quartile	First Quartile	Second Quartile	Third Quartile	Fourth Quartile
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP			14%	86%		13%	8%	79%
CONTROL GROUP								
TOTAL								

June 1, 1971

NOTE: A. Experimental group includes Parks and Breaux Bridge

B. Control group is Cecilia

TABLE 10

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

ITEM NUMBER	PERCENTAGES OF TEACHER RESPONSES							
	NEVER		SOMETIMES		FREQUENTLY		ALWAYS	
	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY
1					45%	66%	55%	34%
2			20%		25%	16%	55%	84%
3			15%		25%	34%	60%	66%
4			30%		35%	66%	35%	34%
5			20%		40%	16%	40%	84%
6			20%	16%	50%	68%	30%	16%
7			5%		30%		65%	100%
8			15%		30%	50%	55%	50%
9			15%		75%	84%	10%	16%
10			10%		25%	50%	65%	50%
11			10%	16%	65%	50%	25%	34%
12			10%		65%	50%	25%	50%
13	20%		30%	50%	20%	34%	30%	16%
14	25%	16%	25%	16%	10%	50%	40%	18%
15			20%	16%	35%	50%	45%	34%
16			5%	16%	60%	50%	35%	34%
17 a			5%		5%	16%	5%	50%
b			5%		10%	32%	5%	
c			10%		5%	50%	5%	34%
d			5%		5%	34%	5%	
e			5%		10%	34%	5%	
f					5%		5%	16%
18					5%	16%	95%	84%

June 15, 1971

TABLE 11

DIRECTOR'S INTERVIEW

Of

MASTER TEACHERS

OBJECTIVE NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS ACHIEVING OBJECTIVES		OBJECTIVE NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS ACHIEVING OBJECTIVES	
	FEB.	MAY		FEB.	MAY
1	100%	100%	17		
2	100%	100%	18	50%	50%
3	16%	38%	19	50%	50%
4	100%	100%	20	84%	84%
5	66%	70%	21		
6	100%	75%	22		
7	100%	100%	23	16%	50%
8	84%	84%	24	66%	38%
9	84%	84%	25	50%	25%
10	50%	50%	26	66%	25%
11	100%	100%	27	33%	25%
12	50%	50%	28	50%	63%
13	50%	50%	29	100%	100%
14	50%	50%	30	100%	100%
15		25%	31	66%	63%
16	16%	16%	32	50%	

June 15, 1971

TABLE 12

DIRECTOR'S INTERVIEW

of

SPECIALIST TEACHERS

OBJECTIVE NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS ACHIEVING OBJECTIVES		OBJECTIVE NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS ACHIEVING OBJECTIVES	
	FEB.	MAY		FEB.	MAY
1	100%	100%	17		
2	100%	100%	18	100%	
3	50%	50%	19	100%	50%
4	100%	100%	20	100%	50%
5			21		
6		50%	22		
7	100%	50%	23		
8	50%		24	100%	50%
9			25	100%	50%
10			26		
11	50%		27	50%	100%
12			28	100%	100%
13			29	100%	100%
14			30	100%	100%
15			31	100%	100%
16	50%		32	100%	

June 15, 1971

TABLE 13

DIRECTOR RATING OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL

OBJECTIVE NUMBER	PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES							
	VERY GOOD		GOOD		AVERAGE		POOR	
	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY
1	61%	57%	38%	43%				
2			77%	100%	8%			
3	61%	43%	38%	57%				
4	61%		38%	86%				
5	46%	57%	46%	43%	8%			
6	38%	43%	53%	57%				
7	53%	43%	38%	43%				
	YES		PERHAPS		UNCERTAIN		NO	
	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY
8	100%	100%						
9	100%	100%						
10	100%	100%						
11		100%						
12	100%	100%						
13	92%	100%	8%					
14	92%	100%	8%					

June 15, 1971

TABLE 14

SELF-RATING OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL

OBJECTIVE NUMBER	PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES							
	VERY GOOD		GOOD		AVERAGE		POOR	
	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY
1	30%	50%	60%	50%	10%			
2	15%	16%	10%	84%	40%		5%	
3	30%	50%	40%	34%	30%	16%		
4	45%	50%	25%	50%	15%			
5	25%	33%	30%	33%	10%	33%		
6	25%	16%	50%	84%	5%			
7	45%	50%	30%	50%	10%			
	YES		PERHAPS		UNCERTAIN		NO	
	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY
8	50%	100%	15%		5%			
9	65%	60%	25%	40%	5%			
10	35%	60%	30%	40%				
11	50%	50%	25%	34%				16%
12	50%	50%	35%	34%		16%		
13	50%	34%	25%	34%	5%	16%		16%
14	45%	50%	30%	34%	5%	16%		

June 15, 1971

TABLE 15

NUMBER OF CONTACTS

AND
COMMUNICATIONS FROM PARENTS

SCHOOL	TEACHER	GRADE	NUMBER OF CONTACTS	
			FEB.	MAY
Breaux Bridge	Patin	K	66	89
Breaux Bridge	Domingue	K	50	78
Breaux Bridge	Brackin	1st	36	74
Breaux Bridge	Alexander	1st	61	97
Parks	Thibodeaux	K	70	121
Parks	Lewis	1st	52	82

June 15, 1971

TABLE 16

DIRECTOR'S INTERVIEW

of

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ITEM NUMBER	PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES							
	NEVER		SOMETIMES		FREQUENTLY		ALWAYS	
	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY	FEB.	MAY
1					4%	4%	96%	96%
2			3%	3%	16%	16%	81%	81%
3	100%	100%						
4	100%	100%						
5			23%	23%	57%	57%	20%	20%
6	100%	100%						
7							100%	100%
8	100%	100%						
9							100%	100%
10			42%	42%	27%	27%	33%	33%
11			6%	6%	47%	47%	47%	47%
12					16%	16%	84%	84%
13	27%	27%	70%	70%	3%	3%		

June 15, 1971

TABLE 17

DIRECTOR'S INTERVIEW

Of

PARENTS OF SAMPLE OF STUDENTS

ITEM	YES	NO
1	100%	
2	100%	
3	100%	
4	100%	
5	100%	
6	54%	46%
7	85%	15%
8	100%	
9	100%	
10		100%

June 15, 1971

TABLE 18

DIRECTOR'S INTERVIEW

of

SCHOOL PERSONNEL

ITEM	NEVER	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS
1			17%	83%
2			17%	83%
3			50%	50%
4			33%	67%
5			33%	67%
6			17%	83%
7		33%		67%
8			17%	83%
9		33%	67%	
10			33%	67%

June 15, 1971

TABLE 19

OBSERVED BEHAVIOR

INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT: PRODUCT
OBJECTIVE: AFFECTIVE

(MONITOR SCALE)

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

ITEM	FIRST GRADE				KINDERGARTEN			
	NEVER	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS	NEVER	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS
Eager		18%	64%	18%		18%	64%	18%
Lazy	45%	45%	10%		45%	55%		
A Pest	64%	36%			82%	9%	9%	
Helpful		18%	64%	18%		18%	82%	
Honest		9%	55%	36%			82%	18%
Crafty	73%	27%			91%	9%		
Clean		9%	18%	73%			45%	55%
Unkept	73%	18%	9%		64%	36%		
Cooperative		10%	45%	45%			55%	45%
Un-Cooperative	64%	36%			70%	16%	14%	
Relates to Peers			91%	9%			100%	
Jealous	9%	64%	27%		55%	36%	9%	
Popular		64%	36%			55%	45%	
Friendly			100%				100%	
Daydreams	27%	73%			45%	55%		
Moody	18%	82%			36%	64%		
Shy	45%	45%	10%		64%	27%	9%	

TABLE 19

ITEM	FIRST GRADE				KINDERGARTEN			
	NEVER	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS	NEVER	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS
Aggressive		55%	36%	9%		27%	64%	9%
Wants Attention		64%	18%	18%		82%	9%	9%
Careful		27%	64%	9%		36%	64%	
Messy	18%	73%	9%			27%	64%	9%
Blames Others	73%	27%			91%	9%		
Polite	9%	18%	64%	9%	10%	45%	45%	
Non-Polite	8%	23%	23%	46%	73%	27%		
Mean	91%	9%			100%			
Kind	9%	82%	9%		9%	73%	18%	
Selfish		73%	27%				91%	9%
Un-Selfish	9%	55%	36%		9%	64%	27%	
Thoughtful	9%	55%	36%		18%	64%	18%	
Careless	9%	82%	9%			91%	9%	
Smart		45%	55%			64%	27%	9%
Avoids Responsibility	36%	55%	9%		46%	36%	18%	
Dependable		18%	73%	9%		27%	64%	9%
Undependable	55%	36%	9%		64%	27%	9%	
Happy			100%			18%	82%	
Sad	27%	64%	9%		18%	82%		
Relaxed		9%	91%		9%	9%	82%	
Nervous	18%	73%	9%		27%	64%		9%
Rigidly Controls Emotions	45%	55%			73%	27%		

June 15, 1971

TABLE 20

OBSERVED BEHAVIOR

INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT: PRODUCT
OBJECTIVE: AFFECTIVE

(MONITOR SCALE)
CONTROL GROUP

ITEM	FIRST GRADE				KINDERCARTEN			
	NEVER	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS	NEVER	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS
Eager	5%	30%	60%	5%		25%	61%	14%
Lazy	55%	45%			30%	60%	10%	
A Pest	85%	10%	5%		52%	38%	10%	
Helpful	5%	50%	45%		6%	52%	42%	
Crafty	70%	20%	10%		44%	33%	23%	
Honest		5%	65%	30%		28%	58%	14%
Clean	5%	15%	15%	65%	5%	31%	25%	39%
Unkept	55%	30%	10%	5%	42%	22%	26%	10%
Cooperative		10%	65%	25%		12%	78%	10%
Un-Cooperative	75%	15%	10%		50%	34%	16%	
Relates to Peers	5%	15%	80%			36%	61%	3%
Jealous	19%	74%	7%		16%	68%	14%	2%
Popular		65%	35%		14%	68%	16%	2%
Friendly	15%	20%	65%			31%	69%	
Daydreams	65%	30%	5%		36%	52%	12%	
Moody	70%	15%	10%	5%	28%	58%	14%	
Shy	60%	25%	10%	5%	56%	31%	10%	3%

TABLE 20

ITEM	FIRST GRADE				KINDERGARTEN			
	NEVER	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS	NEVER	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS
Aggressive	10%	45%	45%			46%	44%	10%
Wants Attention	5%	70%	25%			44%	40%	16%
Careful	5%	25%	70%		6%	44%	44%	6%
Messy	10%	80%	10%		3%	81%	16%	
Blames Others	70%	25%	5%		44%	32%	24%	
Polite	10%	75%	15%		11%	56%	33%	
Non-Polite	60%	35%	5%		25%	52%	23%	
Mean		80%	20%		61%	25%	14%	
Kind	10%	80%	10%		8%	82%	10%	
Selfish	10%	75%	15%			53%	47%	
Un-Selfish	10%	85%	5%		9%	81%	10%	
Thoughtful	10%	85%	5%		16%	69%	11%	4%
Careless	10%	85%	5%		16%	64%	16%	4%
Smart	10%	50%	35%	5%	8%	42%	42%	8%
Avoids Responsibility	20%	55%	20%	5%	18%	68%	14%	
Dependable	5%	25%	70%		10%	33%	47%	10%
Undependable	65%	25%	10%		40%	44%	10%	6%
Happy	5%	30%	65%		6%	34%	60%	
Sad	35%	60%		5%	14%	72%	7%	7%
Relaxed	5%	40%	50%	5%	6%	40%	52%	2%
Nervous	20%	30%	45%	5%	20%	56%	20%	4%
Rigidly controls emotions	10%	50%	35%	5%	60%	31%	9%	

June 15, 1971

TABLE 21

OBSERVED ATTITUDES

INSTRUCTIONAL CONPONENT: PRODUCT
OBJECTIVE: AFFECTIVE

(MONITOR SCALE)

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

ITEM	FIRST GRADE				KINDERGARTEN			
	NEVER	SOME-TIMES	FRE-QUENTLY	ALWAYS	NEVER	SOME-TIMES	FRE-QUENTLY	ALWAYS
Likes story books		20%	72%	8%		28%	72%	
Thinks reading is fun	4%	16%	72%	8%		28%	72%	
Likes to talk with other children in room	4%	16%	76%	4%			16%	84%
Finds it easy to talk with teachers	20%	20%	50%	10%		37%	54%	9%
Looks at books when work is done	50%	30%	16%	4%	9%	91%		
Appears to be afraid of teachers	90%	10%			91%	9%		
Likes to answer questions in classroom	10%	20%	60%	10%		26%	56%	18%
Likes to go to school		15%	85%			28%	72%	
Feels teacher likes him/her		15%	85%			28%	72%	
Likes to listen to stories		15%	85%				100%	
Likes to talk with custodian	8%	72%	16%	4%				
Likes to talk with other adults at school	72%	16%	8%	4%		72%	28%	
Appears to have friends		50%	50%			28%	72%	
Tries to be neat		20%	80%			19%	81%	
Appears to try to do his best	10%	80%	10%			9%	82%	9%
Appears to be a hard worker	20%	70%	10%			19%	72%	9%

TABLE 21

ITEM	FIRST GRADE				KINDERGARTEN			
	NEVER	SOME-TIMES	FRE-QUENTLY	ALWAYS	NEVER	SOME-TIMES	FRE-QUENTLY	ALWAYS
Appears to play fair with others	5%	75%	15%	5%		9%	72%	19%
Likes to start on new things		15%	75%	10%			100%	
Appears to do things without thinking		5%	90%	5%		73%	27%	
Can express ideas in French		50%	50%			82%	18%	
Can express ideas in English			30%	70%		27%	73%	
Prefers to speak in Dominant Language			10%	90%		82%	9%	9%
Has novel ideas	8%	76%	8%	8%	27%	55%	18%	
Wants to do things his/her way		90%		10%		91%		9%

June 15, 1971

TABLE 22

OBSERVED ATTITUDES

INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT: PRODUCT
OBJECTIVE: AFFECTIVE

(MONITOR SCALE)

CONTROL GROUP

ITEM	FIRST GRADE				KINDERGARTEN			
	NEVER	SOME-TIMES	FRE-QUENTLY	ALWAYS	NEVER	SOME-TIMES	FRE-QUENTLY	ALWAYS
Likes story books	5%	32%	58%	5%	6%	42%	52%	
Thinks reading is fun	10%	60%	30%		8%	54%	38%	
Likes to talk with other children in room		36%	46%	18%	6%	36%	53%	5%
Finds it easy to talk with teachers		44%	40%	16%	7%	36%	52%	5%
Looks at books when work is done	45%	48%	7%		60%	40%		
Appears to be afraid of teachers	75%	25%			82%	18%		
Likes to answer questions in classroom		38%	52%	10%	7%	52%	41%	
Likes to go to school	11%	42%	47%		7%	42%	51%	
Feels teacher likes him/her	9%	40%	51%		7%	37%	56%	
Likes to listen to stories		10%	85%	5%		7%	93%	
Likes to talk with other adults at school	18%	60%	22%		25%	50%	25%	
Appears to have friends	4%	43%	53%		13%	12%	60%	15%
Tries to be neat	8%	26%	52%	14%				
Appears to try to do his best	2%	34%	47%	17%	6%	12%	56%	26%
Appears to be a hard worker	10%	26%	48%	16%	5%	5%	60%	30%
Appears to play fair with others		37%	53%	10%		18%	48%	34%

TABLE 22

ITEM	FIRST GRADE				KINDERGARTEN			
	NEVER	SOME-TIMES	FRE-QUENTLY	ALWAYS	NEVER	SOME-TIMES	FRE-QUENTLY	ALWAYS
Likes to start on new things		30%	62%	8%	6%	6%	88%	
Appears to do things without thinking	8%	52%	40%		8%	78%	14%	
Can express ideas in French	89%	11%			95%	3%	2%	
Can express ideas in English		43%	48%	9%		29%	63%	8%
Prefers to speak in Dominant Language	100%				85%	8%	7%	
Has novel ideas	46%	44%	10%		21%	52%	27%	
Wants to do things his/her way	7%	60%	29%	4%		76%	18%	6%

June 15, 1971